

Padgett, Marianne

attach to Search notes

From: Padgett, Marianne
Sent: Friday, July 13, 2007 12:30 PM
To: Chau, Minh
Cc: Lamb, Brenda
Subject: FW: 10/792,267-restriction probably being mailed

Hi,

the people in generic coating apparatus (class 118) thought the apparatus claims of 10/792,267 were more appropriate for 101/333 (as exemplified by PN 7,117,790 which you issued). Is this the appropriate class/sub & would you or AU 2854 except transfer if the apparatus claims are elected?

Thank you,
Mimi Padgett
AU 1762

-----Original Message-----

From: Padgett, Marianne
Sent: Friday, July 13, 2007 10:34 AM
To: Lamb, Brenda
Subject: 10/792,267-restriction probably being mailed

Hi Brenda,

here's another one, but this time it does have the means for coating. The attorney hasn't called me back, so unless he gets to me before I turn in the little red folder, this is being mailed.

Anyway, apparatus claims are 1-8 & 10-15, with two independent claims both having "illumination system" directed at coated surface, which has been treated with a member with a stamping surface. In claim 1, the stamper prints, while in claim 10 it transfers a pattern to a resist layer that has been provided by a "mechanism".

I've indicated 118/620+ for the apparatus claims. Is this appropriate & will AU 1734 except transfer if apparatus claims are elected? (probable since there's only one method claim).

Thanks,
Mimi